

REMARKSStatus of claims

Claims 1-20 remain in this application. Claim 1 is amended. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims is respectfully requested in view of the amendment and arguments hereinbelow.

35 USC §112 Rejection

In the Office Action, claim 7 is rejected because of insufficient antecedent basis for "the scrubbing channels". Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly indicate that a pair of scrubbing channels is used. Amended claim 1 is believed to overcome the 35 USC §112 rejection of dependent claim 7.

35 USC §102 Rejection

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 11 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Hayes et al (US Patent No. 6,338,312). The Office Action correctly points out that Hayes discloses an ion implantation process system that includes an ion implanter apparatus for carrying out an ion implantation (see paragraph 5). And, the Office Action further explains that the ion implantation process produces an effluent gas stream which is **discharged** from the ion implantation apparatus in line 112. This effluent, or by product of the implantation process, may be passed through one or more scrubbers before being discharged.

Applicant's invention of claims 1-4, 6-7, 11 and 20, on the other hand, recites a scrubber system used for delivering a gas **to** a semiconductor processing tool. For example, amended independent claim 1 recites, among other things, "a pair of scrubbers coupled with each channel, respectively, each of the scrubbers for removing a gas contaminant from each channel such that a scrubbed gas is delivered through the supply line **to the semiconductor processing tool**". And, independent claim 3 recites, among other things, "purging the second scrubber while directing the gas through the first scrubber, the scrubbed gas from the first scrubber and the second scrubber being delivered **to a semiconductor processing tool**".

Applicant fails to see how the system of Hayes, which is directed to scrubbing discharge gases, teaches the elements of Applicant's claims directed to scrubbing a gas supplied to a semiconductor processing tool. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 1-4, 6-7, 11 and 20 be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 USC §103(a) Rejection

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Green et al. (US Patent No. 5,199,263) in view of Nickens et al. (US Patent No. 6,267,931) and Hayes. Green discloses a coal-fired power plant with a wet scrubber wherein sulfite or bisulfite ions are converted to sulfate ions by forced aeration in the scrubber reaction tank (abstract). In contrast, Nickens discloses a reconfigurable waste treatment system that uses holding vessels large enough for human entry (abstract, col. 4, lines 16-18). As argued above in conjunction with the 35 USC §102(e) rejection, Hayes does not teach as the Examiner purports. Specifically, Hayes teaches a method and apparatus for scrubbing effluent, or waste, gases coming from an ion implantation process. Combining Hayes with the coal fired power plant/scrubber of Green and the waste holding system of Nickens in no way teaches or suggests elements of Applicant's claims 1-20. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 1-20 be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone call would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (508) 416-2475.

Respectfully submitted,

BOWDITCH & DEWEY, LLP

By



Thomas O. Hoover

Date: *July 22, 2004*

Registration No.: 32,470

Direct tel.: (508) 416-2475

Telephone: (508) 879-5700

Facsimile: (508) 929-3073

Bowditch & Dewey, LLP
161 Worcester Road
P.O. Box 9320
Framingham, Massachusetts 01701-9320